

**WASHINGTON STATE
WORKFORCE TRAINING AND EDUCATION COORDINATING BOARD
MEETING NO. 110
May 11, 2006**

***HIGH SKILLS, HIGH WAGES 2006
CHAPTER 4: PERFORMANCE ACCOUNTABILITY***

At the March meeting, the Board reviewed the first draft of *High Skills, High Wages Chapter 4: Performance Accountability*. The Board requested that a second draft be written to simplify the chapter.

The major changes in this second draft are formatting changes.

Changes include:

- Explaining the relationship between this accountability system and Government Management Accountability and Performance (GMAP).
- Reducing the number of desired outcomes from seven to five to correspond with the five state core performance measures.
- Changing the order and organizing more of the chapter's discussion around the five state core measures.
- Clarifying the Workforce Development Councils (WDCs) participation in GMAP and quality efforts.
- Reducing the appendix of targets and results to the five state measures—referring the reader to program operational plans for the federally required indicators for each program.

The second draft does not attempt to address policy questions highlighted at the March meeting.

- Should performance targets be included for the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation, Department of Services for the Blind, and Wagner-Peyser (Labor Exchange)?
- Should the largest increases in performance targets focus improvement efforts on Employer Satisfaction, Participant Earnings, and Educational Attainment, as opposed to Employment Rates and Participant Satisfaction?
- Should there be any change to the WorkSource performance measures?
- Should Section 503 incentive grants have the same policy parameters (e.g., allocated to WDCs for systemwide initiatives only)?

The draft makes no changes on these topics from HSHW 2004. These questions do not have to be settled at this time. But the Board will need to decide these questions before adopting the final version of HSHW 2006.

Following Board review, staff will make changes requested by the Board and then widely disseminate the draft for further input.

Board Action Requested: Adoption of the recommended motion.

RECOMMENDED MOTION

WHEREAS, The state statutes for the Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board require the Board to, “Establish standards for data collection and maintenance for the operating agencies of the state training system ...” and to, “Establish minimum standards for program evaluation for the operating agencies of the state training system,” and,

WHEREAS, Executive Order 99-02 requires the Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board to, “Design and implement a performance management system for workforce development ...” and adds Wagner-Peyser, work-related components of the vocational rehabilitation program, and WorkSource, to the performance management system; and,

WHEREAS, The Workforce Investment Act requires the Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board, as the State Workforce Investment Board, to contain in the state plan “a description of the state performance accountability system developed for the workforce investment activities to be carried out through the statewide workforce investment system, that includes information identifying state performance measures ...” and,

WHEREAS, The Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act requires the Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board, as the state eligible agency, to “ establish a state performance accountability system ... to assess the effectiveness of the state in achieving statewide progress in vocational and technical education, and to optimize the return of investment of federal funds in vocational and technical education activities,” and,

WHEREAS, Washington has created *High Skills, High Wages* as the strategic direction for the state unified plan for workforce development; and,

WHEREAS, Chapter 4 of *High Skills, High Wages* describes the performance accountability system for workforce development; and,

WHEREAS, State statutes require the Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board to update the state strategic plan every two years, and Board staff have developed a draft update of chapter 4 with the input of representatives of the affected state agencies and Workforce Development Councils;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, That the Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board approve the dissemination of draft chapter 4 for public review and comment.

HIGH SKILLS, HIGH WAGES 2006
CHAPTER 4: Performance Accountability

In order to meet the combined challenges of the competitive economy, changing labor force, and to make the best use of increasingly scarce resources, the workforce development system must continuously improve its performance. What counts are results in meeting the needs of our customers—students, job seekers, workers, and employers. The workforce development system must continuously measure results, identify areas to improve, and make the necessary improvements.

Prior to the creation of *High Skills, High Wages*, Washington State did not have an accountability system for workforce development. What we had were separate accountability activities for many of our programs.

Because these accountability activities were developed in order to meet separate program missions and requirements, they did not add up to systemwide accountability. There were no agreed upon measurable goals for the system as a whole, no common performance measures, and no standards for collecting consistent data from agency to agency. Often, data collection focused on inputs rather than results. Some programs did not evaluate what happened to their participants once they left their program, nor did they use program results to guide improvements. This has all changed.

Performance Management for Continuous Improvement

In January 1996, the Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board (Workforce Board) adopted the design for a new accountability system, “Performance Management for Continuous Improvement” (PMCI). Having a systemwide framework has many advantages, including increased accountability, improved strategic planning, better research, more efficient use of resources, and a sense of shared responsibility among workforce development programs. These advantages can improve the credibility of workforce programs and, in turn, enhance the support they receive and, ultimately, their ability to serve customers.

Based on Washington’s success with PMCI, in 2003 the U.S. Department of Labor (DOL) asked the Workforce Board to lead the 50 states in the design of the next generation performance management system. The result is, *Integrated Performance Information for Workforce Development: A Blueprint for States* (IPI). Other states are implementing the IPI Blueprint, and Congress is now considering the IPI performance measures as the standard for workforce development programs.

Congress is expected to reauthorize both the Workforce Investment Act (WIA) and Carl Perkins during 2006. As part of reauthorization, Congress is reconsidering the measures to use for the federal core indicators. Options under consideration include the measures recommended in the IPI Blueprint; this could codify consistent measures across federal workforce programs. At the same time, DOL is moving forward with changes in some of the measures required for DOL programs, changes that may be temporary depending on how Congress acts. How these things will play out remains uncertain at this time. *High Skills, High Wages: 2006* makes no changes to the state core measures pending the outcome of these federal developments.

PMCI Overview

The PMCI accountability system consists of four parts:

- **Desired Outcomes and Performance Measures:** The results that we are continuously working to improve and the measures that indicate how well we are doing.
- **Performance Targets and Consequences:** Numerical targets for results and a combination of incentives and sanctions in response to achieving or not achieving the targets.
- **Data Collection and Reporting:** Standards for the data elements needed to measure and analyze performance, and a series of reports that present results.
- **Government Management Accountability and Performance (GMAP):** Governor Gregoire's system of management measures, reporting, and improvement.

Governor Gregoire has instituted the GMAP system consisting of performance measures for each executive agency, regularly and frequently reporting results, quickly identifying problem areas, and identifying and implementing solutions. GMAP employs real-time measures designed for the unique mission of each agency. This system enables managers to quickly spot near-term changes in their agency performance and make appropriate management changes. (See pages 14 and 15 for more information on GMAP.)

PMCI has a different focus, one that complements GMAP: PMCI focuses on common measures across workforce development programs that share certain desired outcomes (and many of the same customers). Consistent with the Workforce Board's role as policy coordinating body, the measures are designed for policy leaders operating at the "30,000 foot level." The PMCI measures enable policy leaders to know the lasting results of programs so they can make appropriate policy decisions, as opposed to administrative changes and changes in practice to ensure accountability and a focus on results that managers can make at the ground level. Together the PMCI and GMAP accountability systems provide a full array of policy and management.

DESIRED OUTCOMES AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Desired Outcomes

PMCI identifies five desired outcomes for the workforce development system as a whole. These outcomes focus on the difference workforce development makes in the lives of program participants, their families, and their communities. They are the outcomes that policy leaders want to see. They are not static targets, but conditions that should be increasingly true for all people. Results on indicators of these outcomes are measured for the population as a whole and separately for women, subgroups of people of color, and people with disabilities.

- **Employment:** Washington's workforce finds employment opportunities.
- **Earnings:** Washington's workforce achieves a family-wage standard of living from earned income.

- **Skills:** Washington’s workforce possesses the skills and abilities required in the workplace.
- **Customer Satisfaction:** Workforce development participants and their employers are satisfied with workforce development services and results.
- **Return on Investment:** Workforce development programs provide returns that exceed program costs.

Performance Measures

Policy leaders are busy people and have to digest a tremendous amount of varied information. Measures are more useful to policy leaders the extent to which they are understood quickly and easily—the fewer the measures the better. Policy leaders do not have the time to understand a dozen different numerators and denominators for each program. The term “employment rate” should not mean many different things depending on the programs measured.

The PMCI performance measures, therefore, are designed around a small set of measures—the Core State Measures—that can be applied, for the most part, vertically and horizontally throughout the workforce development system.

Core State Measures

What are the best performance measures for workforce development if the same measures are applied horizontally and vertically within the system? Core state measures should address the outcomes that policymakers want to see and answer such basic questions as, “Do people get jobs?” “What are they paid?” Beyond this, the measures should meet certain quality criteria. Other things being equal, performance measures are better the extent to which they:

Criteria for Good Performance Measures

- *Are outcome measures:* Performance measures should be measures of the results for customers as opposed to process measures or measures of program outputs.
- *Promote desired results:* Because you get what you measure, measures should be carefully designed to promote behavior and results that are consistent with the desired outcomes.
- *Are easily explainable to a lay audience:* Policy leaders are lay people when it comes to the often arcane subject of performance measures. Keeping it simple is good advice.
- *Create a level playing field among programs and service strategies:* Measures should be designed so that they do not create a bias toward one program or strategy or another.
- *Scaleable and Divisible:* Measures should be applicable, to the extent possible, to local institutions, regional areas, and the state. Measures should also be divisible so that results can be understood for subpopulations and service strategies.

- *Are not easily “gamed”*: While there may be no measure that is completely impervious to manipulation, some measures are more susceptible than others.
- *Inexpensive*: Performance measures are very important for ensuring taxpayer dollars are wisely used, but policy leaders very reasonably want to minimize the amount of money spent on activities other than direct service to customers, and those include performance measurement.

Based on the above criteria, and after a long consensus process, PMCI identifies the below measures as the state’s core measures for workforce development:

State Core Measures

Employment or Further Education

- a. **Programs serving adults**: Percentage of former participants with employment recorded in Unemployment Insurance (UI) and other administrative records during the third quarter after leaving the program.
- b. **Programs serving youth**: Percentage of former participants with employment or further education as recorded in UI, student, and other administrative records during the third quarter after leaving the program.

Earnings

Median annualized earnings of former participants with employment recorded in UI and other administrative records during the third quarter after leaving the program, measured only among the former participants not enrolled in further education during the quarter.

Skills

Percentage or number of program participants leaving the program who achieved appropriate skill gains or were awarded the relevant educational or skill credential based on administrative records.

Customer Satisfaction

- a. **Employer Satisfaction With Former Program Participants**: Percentage of employers who report satisfaction with new employees who are program completers as evidenced by survey responses.
- b. **Former Participant Satisfaction**: Percentage of former participants who report satisfaction with the program as evidenced by survey responses.

Return on Investment

- a. **Taxpayer Return on Investment**: The net impact on tax revenue and social welfare payments compared to the cost of the services.

- b. **Participant Return on Investment:** The net impact on participant earnings and employer provided benefits compared to the cost of the services.

Federal acts, such as the Carl Perkins Act and WIA, specify certain mandatory measures of program results. Mandatory federal core measures, unfortunately, are different for each program. States have the discretion to identify additional state indicators. The above state core measures are additional state indicators for Washington.

The methodology for the core measures relies as much as possible on administrative records as opposed to program staff or participant self-reports. This data source is used in order to enable as much consistency and objectivity across programs as possible, and because it is relatively inexpensive. To measure employment and earnings, the methodology takes advantage of the UI wage files maintained by the Employment Security Department (ESD) (and the equivalent agency in other states). These files hold information on all employment covered by the UI system—approximately 90 percent of all employment. Where available, the UI records are supplemented by other administrative records of employment such as Department of Defense records.

Another important feature of the methodology is the use of the time period of seven to nine months after a participant has left his or her program as the key period for measuring postprogram results. The Workforce Board and its partner agencies reviewed the actual results for each postprogram quarter for three and a half years following program exit for five of the largest workforce development programs. We found that the third postprogram quarter is the best possible single representation of the programs' relative and lasting results without waiting years to obtain long-term results.

Measures at Each Level of the System

Figure 1 shows the PMCI performance measures at each level of the workforce development system. The five levels are:

- **Systemwide:** The workforce development system as defined in statute and executive order.
- **WorkSource:** WorkSource Centers and affiliate sites providing one-stop services as required under WIA Title I-B.
- **Statewide Programs:** Workforce development programs such as Secondary Career and Technical Education and Vocational Rehabilitation that are statewide in scope.
- **Workforce Development Area:** The local geographical area defined under WIA Title I-B
- **Providers:** Individual institutions and entities that provide workforce development services. Examples include individual secondary schools, community and technical colleges, and private career schools, among others.

As Figure 1 shows, PMCI uses the core measures, for the most part, from local providers to the system as a whole. There are some exceptions, however, in order to minimize costs. PMCI does not require customer satisfaction surveys of each local provider, and return on investment is only measured at the statewide level. There are also some additional measures at certain levels, as explained below.

Figure 1
State Core Measures

Level	Employment or Further Education	Earnings	Skills	Customer Satisfaction	Return on Investment	Other Measures
Systemwide	X	X	X	X	X	X
WorkSource	X	X	X	X	X	X
Statewide Programs	X	X	X	X	X	X
Workforce Development Areas	X	X	X	X	X	
Providers	X	X	X			

Statewide Programs

While the state core measures provide the most fundamental information on the outcomes that policy leaders want to see, they do not, by themselves, paint a complete picture of program performance. PMCI has, therefore, identified a larger set of program measures to paint a more complete picture of statewide program results. The longer list of measures include, for example, measures of poverty rates and results for subpopulations. The Workforce Board uses the longer list of program measures every two years in producing the report, *Workforce Training Results*. The longer list of measures may be seen in that report.

WorkSource Measures

WorkSource is Washington's one-stop system for employment and training programs. WorkSource participants include individuals and employers who receive services through a WorkSource Center or an affiliate site providing services funded under WIA Title I, WIA Title III (Wagner-Peyser), or the state's WorkFirst program's employment-related services. Participants in other programs are counted for a particular service when the program dedicates resources for that service to WorkSource. Together, these populations are considered the WorkSource participant population for purposes of accountability.

For registered participants, the WorkSource measures include all of the state core measures, except return on investment, and the federally required measures for WIA Title I. In order to capture the performance of WorkSource in serving all participants, not just those who register, and to help measure how Washington is doing in creating a one-stop system, there are the following additional indicators:

- Percentage of employers using WorkSource services
- Percentage of total workers using WorkSource services

- Customer perception of seamlessness
- Staff perception of seamlessness
- Number of students who are WorkSource participants

The PMCI workgroup is revisiting the above indicators to assess currency and possibly recommend alternative indicators.

Systemwide Measures

In order to measure Washington's progress in achieving the desired outcomes for the workforce development system, PMCI includes systemwide indicators. Some of these are measures of the state's whole workforce, not just individuals who have gone through the programs. We want to know how well the whole state is doing, not just the part of our population who have been program participants. The Workforce Board reports the results each year in *Measuring Our Progress*.

Systemwide Measures and Most Recently Available Results

Employment

- The number of new jobs created in Washington per year (does not include agricultural jobs, the count for which is unavailable): 62,600 in 2000; ____ in 2005.
- Percentage of workforce development program participants self-reporting employment six to nine months after leaving their program: 79 percent for 2000 participants; ____ percent for 2004.

Earnings

- Mean annual earnings of Washington workers (stated in constant dollars in order to control for inflation): \$ ____ in 2000; \$ ____ in 2005.
- Annual earnings of workforce development program participants seven to nine months after leaving their program (stated in constant dollars in order to control for inflation): \$ ____ for 2000 participants; \$ ____ for 2004 participants.
- The ratio of dislocated workers' earnings after program participation compared to their earnings prior to dislocation: 94 percent for 2000 participants; and ____ percent for 2004 participants.
- The number of Washington residents living in poverty for every 100 U.S. residents living in poverty: ____ in 2000; ____ in 2005
- Among workforce development participants starting below the poverty line, the percentage with personal earnings above the poverty line during the second year after leaving their program: 50 percent for 2000 participants; ____ percent for 2002 participants.

Skills

- Percentage of students entering ninth grade class who graduate with their class: 66 percent in 2002; 70 percent in 2004.
- Percentage of the demand for workers with between one and four years of postsecondary training (the number of annual net job openings) that can be filled by the annual supply of community and technical college students, private career school students, and apprentices prepared for work: The supply was 77 percent of demand in 2000; ____ in 2004.
- Percentage of workforce training participants who report their job-specific skills improved a lot: 69 percent for 2000 participants; ____ percent for 2004.
- Percentage of employed former workforce training participants who report their training was related to the job held nine months after leaving their program: 83 percent for 2000 participants; ____ percent for 2004.

Customer Satisfaction

- Percentage of former workforce training participants satisfied with program services and results: 91 percent for 2000 participants; ____ percent for 2004.
- Percentage of Washington employers satisfied with the overall quality of former training participants' work: 89 percent in 2001; ____ percent in 2005.

Return on Investment

- The average ratio of training participants' net gain in earnings and benefits (projected to age 65) to program public costs: \$4.1 to \$1 for 2000 participants; ____ for 2004 participants.

PERFORMANCE TARGETS AND CONSEQUENCES

Performance Targets for Core Measures

Statewide Programs

For statewide programs, the Workforce Board identifies expected levels of performance on each of the state and federal core measures with the exception of return on investment. (Targets are not set for return on investment because the methodology is not sufficiently precise and is too costly to conduct frequently.) These expected levels of performance are for secondary and postsecondary vocational education, WIA Title I-B, and WIA Title II Adult Education and Family Literacy. In future modifications of the strategic and operational plans, additional programs of the workforce development system could be added to this process.

The Workforce Board identifies performance targets based upon past performance and expectations for future improvement. The expected level of performance is not the same for each program. Programs serve different populations for different purposes. Programs that serve youth, for example, should not be expected to have the same performance as programs serving adults.

Also, the expected increase is not the same for each measure. Some areas of performance are more difficult to change than others. In some areas, programs are already performing at or near peak levels, so little if any improvement can be expected, while in other areas, substantial improvements can and should be made. The Workforce Board's performance targets for the future emphasize improving Employer Satisfaction, Participant Earnings, and Educational Attainment.

The Workforce Board sets the targets for the state core measures and negotiates and reaches agreement on the targets for the federal indicators with the Department of Labor (DOL) for WIA Title I and the U.S. Department of Education (DOE) for Perkins.

The appendix to this chapter shows the state core measures, targets, and results for secondary and postsecondary career and technical education, WIA Title I, and Adult Education and Literacy. (The operating plan for each program has the targets for the federally required measures.) Included in the appendix are the actual results for the last three years and the expected levels of performance for the next two years.

Performance, of course, is affected by the demographic characteristics of program participants, as well as economic conditions. Should the economic conditions and demographic characteristics change in the future, the Workforce Board will revise the performance targets on the state indicators and negotiate revisions with DOE and DOL for Carl Perkins and WIA Title I, respectively.

Workforce Development Areas

The Workforce Board establishes performance targets on each of the state and federal core measures for WIA Title I for the local WDCs. The expected levels of performance depend on local economic conditions and the demographic characteristics of participants served. In order to adjust expected local levels of performance for such factors, the Workforce Board applies multiple regression models. So for example, the Board lowers the performance targets for a local area to the extent that its program participants have demographic characteristics indicating that participants are harder to serve than the state average. The local council and Chief Local Elected Official(s) may request changes to the performance targets and may introduce data not considered by the models.

Providers

The Workforce Board maintains the state Eligible Training Provider List (ETPL) www.wtb.wa.gov/etp. This is the list of training programs that are eligible to train students funded by WIA Individual Training Accounts or dislocated workers receiving extended UI benefits under the state's Training Benefits Program. To be on the list, a training program must satisfy the Workforce Board's performance criteria. Each year, the Workforce Board establishes minimum standards that programs must meet for completion rates, employment rates, and earnings of former students. The ETPL identifies the training programs that meet the standards.

Performance-Based Consequences

At each level of the workforce development system, there are consequences for whether or not the performance targets are met.

Systemwide

WIA authorizes incentive funding for states that exceed the “adjusted levels of performance” in WIA Title I-B, Adult Education and Family Literacy, and Career and Technical Education. A state that achieves 100 percent on the average for all the federal core indicators for each program is considered to have exceeded the adjusted levels of performance, so long as performance does not fall below 80 percent on any indicator.

When Washington State receives such an incentive award, the state allocates the funds to local areas that exceeded their expected level of performance in these programs, including performance on the state core measures, as well as on the federal core indicators. The Workforce Board identifies the size of the award for each year, and ESD allocates the funds. The funds must be used for system building activities, not activities that pertain only to a particular program, i.e., WIA Title I-B, Adult Education and Family Literacy, or Vocational Education.

Figure 2.
Performance-Based Consequences

Level	Performance-based Consequences
Systemwide	WIA Section 503 Incentive Awards
Statewide Programs	U.S. DOL and DOE Required Improvement Plans and Sanctions
Workforce Development Area	WIA State Incentive Awards, Improvement Plans, Sanctions, Reorganization
Providers	ETPL Eligibility, DOE Required Improvement Plans, Perkins Sanctions, and Market-Based Reactions

Statewide Programs

If the state fails to meet the adjusted levels of performance on the federal core indicators for WIA Title I-B for two consecutive years, DOL can withhold up to five percent of the state’s WIA Title I-B funds. DOL considers states to have failed to meet the levels if performance falls below 80 percent of the target levels.

Under the Carl Perkins Act, if the state fails to meet the “adjusted levels of performance” the “state eligible agency,” which is the Workforce Board, must develop and implement a program improvement plan in consultation with the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI), the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges (SBCTC), and other partners. If the state fails to meet the levels of performance for a second consecutive year, DOE may withhold all or a portion of Carl Perkins Act funds from the state.

If the state is sanctioned by DOE for poor performance, the Workforce Board will reduce the allocation of funds to the secondary and/or postsecondary systems proportional to the sanction and to the extent that the secondary and/or postsecondary systems contributed to the poor results.

Workforce Development Areas

For WIA Title I-B, the Governor earmarks a portion of the state set aside to reward local areas that exceed 100 percent of the average of the expected levels of performance for the state and federal core measures. The Workforce Board establishes the policy for incentive awards and ESD allocates these funds to local areas.

If a local area fails to achieve 80 percent average performance across the state and federal core indicators for WIA Title I-B, ESD will require the local council to submit either a performance improvement plan or a modified local plan to the state. If such failure continues for a second consecutive year, the Governor may require the development of a reorganization plan. If the state is sanctioned by DOL for poor performance, ESD will withhold a proportional amount of funds from local areas based on their average performance across the state and federal core indicators.

Providers

To be eligible to receive funding under WIA Title I-B or to train dislocated workers under the state's Training Benefits Program, all training providers must meet the performance standards established by the Workforce Board. If a training provider fails to meet the standards for any one year, the provider will not be an eligible provider for the year beginning the first quarter after the substandard performance is reported.

Under the Carl Perkins Act if a college or school district is not making substantial progress in achieving the expected levels of performance, SBCTC or OSPI, on behalf of the Workforce Board, will assess what is needed to overcome the performance deficiencies, approve a local improvement plan, and conduct regular evaluations of progress.

If the Workforce Board allocation of the Carl Perkins Act funds to the secondary or postsecondary system is reduced due to federal sanctions, OSPI and SBCTC will determine the resulting impact on school districts and colleges, respectively, and allocate the funds accordingly.

SBCTC/Office of Adult Literacy has identified similar performance-based interventions for Adult and Family Literacy applications.

The Workforce Board operates a consumer report system of training provider results, as well as course descriptions and other key information for potential students (www.jobtrainingresults.org). The consumer report system enables market-based consequences by which provider performance may result in potential customers moving their dollars from lesser to better performing providers.

DATA COLLECTION AND REPORTING

Data Collection

The Workforce Board provides information on the results of secondary and postsecondary Career and Technical Education; WIA Title I-B; work-related Adult Education and Family Literacy, and other workforce development programs; and the WorkSource One-Stop system to the appropriate federal agencies, state policymakers, and local workforce development councils. To accomplish this, the Workforce Board ensures that participant data from each of these programs and from WorkSource are collected and matched with administrative records for the purpose of measuring the common and core indicators. The Workforce Board also conducts participant and employer surveys for these programs and for WorkSource.

The specific data source(s) for participant records for each program is identified in the program's operating plan. For WorkSource participants, the Services, Knowledge and Information Exchange System (SKIES) collects and maintains data. The following figure shows the data elements, at a minimum, that are to be collected and recorded for all WorkSource participants who request services other than self-service or information only services.

Common Data Elements That are Collected at Intake on Program Participants

- | | | |
|-----------------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 1. Date | 2. First Name | 3. Last Name |
| 4. Phone/FAX/E-Mail | 5. Address | 6. Social Security # |
| 7. Services Requested | 8. Gender M/F | 9. Limited English Y/N |
| 10. Date of Birth | | |
11. Disability Status—Do you have a physical or mental impairment that:
- a. Limits the kind or amount of work you can do at a job? Y/N
 - b. Prevents you from working at a job? Y/N
12. What is your highest grade completed?
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22+
13. What is the highest level of certification or degree you have achieved?
- High school diploma
 - GED
 - Some schooling after high school but no degree or certificate
 - Vocational certificate/diploma
 - Two-year Associates Vocational degree
 - Two-year Associates Academic degree
 - Bachelors degree
 - Graduate degree
 - Other

14. With which racial group do you most closely identify? For selection of specific choices, use current U.S. Census elements.
15. Intake Location
16. Currently Employed? Y/N
17. U.S. Veteran: Y/N
18. Displaced Homemaker: Y/N
19. Out-of-School Youth: Y/N
20. Family Size
21. Receive Public Cash Assistance: Y/N

Data Matching

The Workforce Board, SBCTC, ESD, and OSPI oversee a shared system for matching participant records with other administrative records, including UI wage records and college and university student enrollment records. Washington uses this process for measuring the performance indicators that are based on administrative record matches. Using the shared matching system ensures that common methodological protocols are applied in calculating the results of workforce development programs.

Training providers that want to offer training funded through Individual Training Accounts authorized under WIA Title I-B are required to submit cost and participant data to the Workforce Board. The Workforce Board uses the data matching system to match the participant records against other administrative records in order to measure provider performance.

Survey Data

For survey-based research, the Workforce Board and its partner agencies have identified a pool of common survey questions. There are two pools of questions: one for individual participants and one for employers. The questions form the content of the Workforce Board's survey research. The questions also are a pool from which other workforce development programs and agencies may draw when surveying individuals or employers about their program experience or outcomes. The use of the common questions helps to ensure consistency in survey-based research throughout the system.

Performance Reports

The following figure shows the schedule of Workforce Board reports on the performance of the workforce development system and programs.

Workforce Board Performance Reports

Name of Report	Frequency	Subject
<i>WIA Title I-B Quarterly Report</i>	Quarterly	WIA Title I-B: Report to DOL on the performance of the state and local workforce development areas on WIA Title I-B on federal and state core indicators.
<i>WIA Title I-B Annual Report</i>	Annual	WIA Title I-B: Report to DOL on the performance of the state and local workforce development areas on WIA Title I-B.
<i>Consolidated Annual Report</i>	Annual	Career and Technical Education: Report to DOE on the performance of secondary and postsecondary career and technical education.
<i>Measuring our Progress</i>	Annual	Systemwide Indicators: Report on the state's performance on the workforce development systemwide indicators.
<i>Workforce Training Results</i>	Biennial	Major Program Results: Report on the performance of the major workforce development programs.
<i>Workforce Focus</i>	Biennial	Target Populations: Report on the performance of the major workforce development programs in serving target populations.

In addition, as mentioned above, the Workforce Board maintains an on-line consumer report system of training provider results that can be found at: www.jobtrainingresults.org.

GOVERNMENT MANAGEMENT ACCOUNTABILITY AND PERFORMANCE

In 2005, Governor Gregoire issued Executive Order 05-02 to establish a comprehensive Government Management Accountability and Performance system (GMAP). GMAP is a management system that focuses on measuring performance, regularly and frequently reporting results, quickly identifying problem areas, and identifying and implementing solutions. As stated in the Executive Order:

GMAP calls upon the Governor and other agency leaders to:

1. Take personal responsibility and hold the agency and its management accountable for results.
2. Use strategies that work, and make corrections when they don't.
3. Base decisions not on guesswork or preference but on accurate, up-to-date information.
4. Make decisions timely.
5. Follow up to make sure there's implementation after a decision has been made.
6. Take risks and learn from mistakes.
7. Communicate clearly to citizens about results.

GMAP requires each agency to:

1. Develop clear, relevant and easy-to-understand measures that show whether or not programs are successful.
2. Demonstrate how programs contribute to the priorities that are important to citizens.

3. Gather, monitor, and analyze program data.
4. Evaluate the effectiveness of programs.
5. Hold regular problem-solving sessions within the agency to improve performance.
6. Allocate resources based on strategies that work.
7. Regularly report to the Governor on their performance.

Governor Gregoire also requested, and the Legislature passed, House Bill (HB) 1970. HB 1970 codifies GMAP in state statutes and extends its coverage to all state agencies, including higher education institutions and agencies headed by other elected officials. **As a result, all agencies that are part of the workforce development system are now implementing GMAP.** Agencies have identified key performance measures, are tracking the results, and holding regular management meetings to fix problems. Local WDCs are a part of this process in collaboration with ESD.

The GMAP measures and the measures in this chapter are complementary. The measures in the PMCI system provide consistent information across programs on long-term results. This is very useful information to elected officials and agency leaders for policy initiatives, strategic planning, and other efforts. GMAP, on the other hand, provides measures that are more real-time and more useful to the managers on the ground as they make day-to-day decisions on program operations.

HB 1970 also continues and expands upon the efforts earlier established by Governor Locke to bring Malcolm Baldrige Criteria for Performance Excellence to state government. HB 1970 requires each agency, no later than 2008, to apply at least once every three years to the “Washington State Quality Award, or a similar organization, for an independent assessment of its quality management, accountability and performance system.” The assessment will evaluate the Baldrige categories of: leadership, strategic planning, customer focus, analysis and information, employee performance management, and process improvement. “The purpose of the assessment is to recognize best practice and identify improvement opportunities.”

Consistent with HB 1970 and WIA’s call for continuous quality improvement, the WorkSource system has widely implemented quality principles. In order to be initially certified during 1999, the state required each WorkSource center and affiliate site to complete a self-assessment based upon the quality categories of the Malcolm Baldrige Criteria. In addition to the self-assessment, WorkSource operators were required to sign a statement that confirms a commitment to continuous quality improvement and focus on priority areas of need.

Such quality efforts are expected to continue in the future. Under WIA, each local area must provide in its local WIA Title I-B plan, “a description of how the local board will ensure the continuous improvement of eligible providers of services through the system (the one-stop delivery system) and ensure that such providers meet the employment needs of local employers and participants.”

In order to meet this requirement, local councils are encouraged to continue to conduct annual self-assessments using a tool that uses the Malcolm Baldrige Quality Criteria. The self-assessment process should involve all partner programs staff involved in WorkSource centers. Measurements of the business results should include the state and federal core indicators for WIA Title I-B.

A critical part of quality improvement is customer focus. WorkSource centers and affiliates should measure customer satisfaction during the time of service and at the time of exit from service. This information should be used to improve the day-to-day operation of WorkSource.

Finally, the WDCs should include a description of their quality efforts in either their strategic or operational plan.

Closing

The next chapter of *High Skills, High Wages* sets forth the key goals, objectives, and strategies for the workforce development system in Washington for 2006-2008. The success of that action plan will be evidenced by the results of the performance accountability system described in this chapter.

APPENDIX

State Core Measures and Statewide Program Performance and Targets

State Core Measures	Performance			Targets	
WIA Title I – Youth	(Year 1)	(Year 2)	(Year 3)	(Year 4)	(Year 5)
Employment or Further Education - Percentage of former participants who were employed, in the military, or enrolled in education or training during the third quarter after the program (all youth).	59.3%	79.8%	72.0%	68.0%	70.0%
Earnings (2003 Dollars) - Median annualized earnings of former participants during the third quarter after leaving the program. (Only former participants not enrolled in further education were counted for this indicators.)	\$7,557	\$7,237	\$9,231	\$8,881	\$9,325
Skills - Percentage of participants who obtained an appropriate credential.	46.5%	51.4%	67.6%	67.0%	69.0%
Employer Satisfaction - Percentage of employers who reported satisfaction with new employees who were program completers as evidenced by survey responses to the biennial survey conducted by the Workforce Board. (Not required below the state level. Not calculated separately for youth, adults, or dislocated workers.)	72.8%	N.A.	83.1%	N.A.	
Participant Satisfaction - Percentage of former participants who reported satisfaction with the program as evidenced by survey responses six to nine months after leaving the program.	94.6%	N.A.	94.1%	94.0%	94.0%

State Core Measures	Performance			Targets	
WIA Adults	(Year 1)	(Year 2)	(Year 3)	(Year 4)	(Year 5)
Employment - Percentage of former participants who were employed during the third quarter after leaving the program. (Only former participants, not enrolled in further education, were counted for this indicator.)	68.2%	66.1%	74.5%	74.0%	75.0%
Earnings (2003 Dollars) - Median annualized earnings of former participants during the third quarter after leaving the program. (Only former participants not enrolled in further education were counted for this indicator.)	\$15,848	\$16,436	\$18,174	\$18,714	\$19,276

State Core Measures	Performance			Targets	
WIA Adults	(Year 1)	(Year 2)	(Year 3)	(Year 4)	(Year 5)
Skills - Percentage of participants who obtained an appropriate credential.	39.7%	62.6%	62.4%	63.0%	65.0%
Employer Satisfaction - Percentage of employers who reported satisfaction with new employees who were program completers as evidenced by survey responses to the biennial survey conducted by the Workforce Board. (Not required below the state level. Not calculated separately for youth, adults, or dislocated workers.)	72.8%	N.A.	83.1%	N.A.	
Participant Satisfaction (S) - Percentage of former participants who reported satisfaction with the program as evidenced by survey responses six to nine months after leaving the program.	85.8%	N.A.	90.6%	90.0%	90.0%

State Core Measures	Performance			Targets	
WIA Title I – Dislocated Worker	(Year 1)	(Year 2)	(Year 3)	(Year 4)	(Year 5)
Employment - Percentage of former participants who were employed during the third quarter after leaving the program. (Only former participants, not enrolled in further education, were counted for this indicator.)	76.4%	78.3%	79.7%	80.0%	80.0%
Earnings (2003 Dollars) - Median annualized earnings of former participants during the third quarter after leaving the program. (Only former participants not enrolled in further education were counted for this indicator.)	\$24,574	\$26,180	\$26,470	\$28,361	\$29,212
Skills - Percentage of participants who obtained an appropriate credential.	46.3%	71.8%	64.8%	70.0%	72.0%
Employer Satisfaction - Percentage of employers who reported satisfaction with new employees who were program completers as evidenced by survey responses to the biennial survey conducted by the Workforce Board. (Not required below the state level. Not calculated separately for youth, adults, or dislocated workers.)	72.8%	N.A.	83.1%	N.A.	
Participant Satisfaction - Percentage of former participants who reported satisfaction with the program as evidenced by survey responses six to nine months after leaving the program.	86.96%	N.A.	89.5%	89.0%	89.0%

State Core Measures	Performance			Targets	
Secondary CTE	(Year 1)	(Year 2)	(Year 3)	(Year 4)	(Year 5)
<i>Employment or Further Education</i> - Percentage of completers who were employed, in the military, or enrolled in further education or training during the third quarter after leaving.	73.4%	75.8%	74.4%	71.6%	72.1%
<i>Earnings</i> (2003 Dollars) - Median annualized earnings of former participants during the third quarter after leaving the program. (Only former participants not enrolled in further education were counted for this indicator.)	\$10,613	\$10,613	\$10,424	\$10,529	\$10,634
<i>Skills</i> - Percentage of participants who obtained an appropriate credential.	92.8%	94.9%	92.0%	93.2%	93.2%
<i>Employer Satisfaction with Participants</i> (S) - Percentage of employers who reported satisfaction with new employees who were program completers as evidenced by survey responses to the biennial survey conducted by the Workforce Board. (Not required below the state level.)	81.3%	N.A.	81.6%	N.A.	80.0%
<i>Participant Satisfaction</i> (S) - Percentage of former participants who reported satisfaction with the program as evidenced by survey responses six to nine months after leaving the program. (Not required below the state level.)	97.0%	N.A.	95.7%	N.A.	95.0%

State Core Measures	Performance			Targets	
Postsecondary CTE	(Year 1)	(Year 2)	(Year 3)	(Year 4)	(Year 5)
<i>Employment or Further Education</i> – Percentage of former participants who were employed, in the military, or enrolled in further education or training during the third quarter after leaving.	76.9%	76.9%	75.1%	72.4%	72.9%
<i>Earnings</i> (S) (2003 Dollars) – Median annualized earnings of former participants during the third quarter after leaving the program. (Only former participants not enrolled in further education were counted for this indicator.)	\$22,894	\$22,466	\$21,525	\$21,740	\$21,958
<i>Skills</i> – Number of participants prepared for the workforce	18,973	N.A.	22,319	20,300	22,600

State Core Measures	Performance			Targets	
Postsecondary CTE	(Year 1)	(Year 2)	(Year 3)	(Year 4)	(Year 5)
<i>Employer Satisfaction with Participants</i> (S) – Percentage of employers who reported satisfaction with new employees who were program completers as evidenced by survey responses to the biennial survey conducted by the Workforce Board. (Not required below the state level.)	88.1%	N.A.	91.1%	N.A.	90.0%
<i>Participant Satisfaction</i> (S) – Percentage of former participants who reported satisfaction with the program as evidenced by survey responses six to nine months after leaving the program. (Not required below the state level.)	91.8%	N.A.	87.2%	N.A.	91.0%

State Core Measures	Performance			Targets	
Adult Basic Education	(Year 1)	(Year 2)	(Year 3)	(Year 4)	(Year 5)
<i>Employment</i> - Percentage of former participants who were employed or in the military during the third quarter after leaving.	60%	N.A.	55%	56%	56%
<i>Earnings</i> (2003 Dollars) - Median annualized earnings of former participants during the third quarter after leaving the program. (Only former participants not enrolled in further education were counted in this indicator.)	\$15,804	N.A.	\$15,104	\$15,255	\$15,406
<i>Employer Satisfaction with Participants</i> - Percentage of employers who reported satisfaction with new employees who were program completers as evidenced by survey responses to the biennial survey conducted by the Workforce Board. (Not required below the state level.)	77.2%	N.A.	87.5%	N.A.	89%
<i>Participant Satisfaction</i> - Percentage of former participants who reported satisfaction with the program as evidenced by survey responses six to nine months after leaving the program. (Not required below the state level.)	87.0%	N.A.	85.3%	N.A.	87%

Performance Management for Continuous Improvement
Workgroup Members

Phil Degon
Employment Security Department

Evelyn Hawkins
Workforce Training and Education
Coordinating Board

James Hu
Workforce Training and Education
Coordinating Board

Mehrnaz Jamzadeh
Workforce Training and Education
Coordinating Board

Gary Kamimura
Employment Security Department

Alex Kosmides
Northwest Workforce Development Council

John Loyle
Pacific Mountain Workforce Development
Council

Sandy Miller
Employment Security Department

Dave Pavelchek
Washington State University: Social and
Economic Sciences Research Center

David Prince
State Board for Community and Technical
Colleges

Karen Pyle
Workforce Training and Education
Coordinating Board

Patricia Stoneman Lowe
Department of Social and Health
Services/Division of Vocational
Rehabilitation

Dave Wallace
Employment Security Department

Greg Weeks
Employment Security Department

Doug Whittaker
State Board for Community and Technical
Colleges

Gena Wikstrom
Washington Federation for Private Career
Schools and Colleges

Bryan Wilson
Workforce Training and Education
Coordinating Board

Carl Wolfhagen
Workforce Training and Education
Coordinating Board